

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 9-15, 19, 28-34, 38, 50, and 53-60.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 16-18, 20-27, 35-37, 39-49, 51, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Falco et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,996). All of the Examiner's objections have been met by amendment and the arguments presented herein.

Claims 1, 20, and 39 have been amended to include the limitation that the dequeued pages are assigned to the paging channel after the pages are dequeued. That the assignment of the dequeued pages to the paging channel takes place after the dequeuing of the pages may be inferred from Fig. 5, which is described in the Specification at page 12, line 26 to page 13, line 20. In Fig. 5, it can be seen that page requests are assigned to an appropriate page queue by the Service to Priority/Queue Mapper 201. The Queuing Controller 301 then dequeues the pages from the page queues and then assigns the pages to the Paging Channel 401 for transmission thereon.

Similarly, claims 16, 35, and 47 have been amended to include the limitation that the dequeued pages are assigned to one of the paging channels after the pages are dequeued. That the assignment of the dequeued pages to one of the paging channel takes place after the dequeuing of the pages may be inferred from Fig. 10, which is described in the Specification at page 15, lines 4-13. In Fig. 10, it can be seen that page requests are assigned to an appropriate page queue by the Service to Priority/Queue Mapper 201. The Queuing Controller 301 then dequeues the pages from the page queues and then assigns the pages to the Paging Channels 401 to 40M for transmission thereon.

In the paragraphs which follow, the Applicant will address the Examiner's objections to the specific claims of the present application. The Applicant's arguments are numbered in accordance with the paragraphs of the Examiner's Detailed Action.

1. Claims 1, 20 and 39

The Examiner has found that Falco discloses all of the elements of claims 1, 20 and 39. In particular, the Examiner has found that Falco discloses assigning page requests relating to different services to each of the page queues based on the determined service-to-queue mapping.

Amended claims 1, 20 and 39 now include the limitation that the dequeued pages are assigned to the paging channel after the pages are dequeued.

Falco does not disclose a method or apparatus in which the dequeued pages are assigned to the paging channel after the pages are dequeued. The disclosure in Falco is restricted to a method for prioritizing messages within a control channel where such messages have already been accepted for transmission on that control channel (the Applicant notes that a paging channel is a form of control channel, and that these terms will therefore be used interchangeably in this argument). That is, the messages are assigned to the control channel and, more particularly, the time slot within the control channel corresponding to the mobile station to which the message is directed, prior to the steps of queuing and dequeuing (see column 4, lines 62-65).

The Applicant submits that in view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, claims 1, 20 and 39 are not anticipated by Falco and are therefore allowable.

2. Claims 2, 7, 17, 21, 26, 27, 36, 40, 45, 46, and 48

The Examiner has found that the Falco discloses that the service-to-queue mapping is determined dynamically according to the current state of the queues.

Claims 2, 21, and 40 depend directly or indirectly on claims 1, 20 and 39. For at least the reasons expressed in section 1, above, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 20 and 39 are not anticipated by Falco, and claims 2, 21, and 40 are therefore also allowable.

Claims 7, 17, 26, 27, 36, 40, 45, 46, and 48 depend directly or indirectly on claims 4, 16, 23, 25, 35, 39, 42, 44, and 47. For at least the reasons presented in sections 3-7, below, the Applicant submits that claims 4, 16, 23, 25, 35, 39, 42, 44, and 47 are not anticipated by Falco, and claims 7, 17, 26, 27, 36, 40, 45, 46, and 48 are therefore also allowable.

3. Claims 3, 22, 41, and 51

The Examiner has found that Falco discloses assigning page requests relating to different services to each of the paging channels according to a pre-determined service-to-paging channel mapping.

Claims 3, 22, and 41 include the limitation of assigning page requests relating to different services to each of the paging channels according to a pre-determined service-to-paging channel mapping.

The Applicant submits that Falco does not disclose a system in which a plurality paging channels are utilized, and therefore does not disclose a method or apparatus in which page requests relating to different services are assigned to each of the paging channels according to a pre-determined service-to-paging channel mapping. As discussed in section 1, above, the disclosure of Falco is restricted to a method for prioritizing messages within one control channel. More particularly, Falco discloses a method for scheduling messages by controlling the utilization of time-slots within one control channel (see, for example, column 1, lines 6-9, and column 5, lines 57-61). Falco does not disclose a method for scheduling messages using multiple control channels and as such does not disclose a method in which page requests relating to different services are assigned to each of the control (paging) channels according to a service-to-control (paging) channel mapping.

The Applicant submits that in view of the arguments presented herein, claims 3, 22 and 41 are allowable.

With respect to claim 51, the Applicant notes that this claim pertains to uplink communications (that is, communications from the mobile station to the base station). As the disclosure in Falco pertains to downlink communications (that is, communications from the base station to the mobile station), the Applicant suspects that the objection to claim 51 may have been included by the Examiner in error. The Applicant requests that the objection to claim 51 be withdrawn.

4. Claims 4, 23, and 42

The Examiner has found that Falco discloses assigning page requests relating to different services to each of the paging channels according to a pre-determined service-to-paging channel mapping.

Claims 4, 23, and 42 include the limitation of assigning page requests relating to different services to each of the paging channels according to a pre-determined service-to-paging channel mapping.

As discussed in section 3, above, the Applicant submits that Falco does not disclose a system in which a plurality of paging channels are utilized, and therefore does not disclose a method or apparatus in which page requests relating to different services are assigned to each of the paging channels according to a pre-determined service-to-paging channel mapping. Therefore, the Applicant submits that in view of the arguments presented herein, claims 4, 23, and 42 are allowable.

5. Claims 5, 6, 24, 25, 43, 44, and 52

The Examiner has found that Falco discloses that the service-to-queue mapping is determined dynamically according to the current state of the queues.

Each of claims 5, 6, 24, 25, 43, and 44 depend directly or indirectly on claims 3, 4, 22, 23, 41, and 42. For at least the reasons expressed in sections 3 and 4, above, the Applicant submits that claims 3, 4, 22, 23, 41, and 42 are not anticipated by Falco, and claims 5, 6, 24, 25, 43, and 44 are therefore also allowable.

With respect to claim 52, the Applicant notes that this claim pertains to uplink communications (that is, communications from the mobile station to the base station). As the disclosure in Falco pertains to downlink communications (that is, communications from the base station to the mobile station), the Applicant suspects that the objection to claim 52 may have been included by the Examiner in error. The Applicant requests that the objection to claim 52 be withdrawn.

6. Claims 16, 35 and 47

The Examiner has found that Falco discloses all of the elements of claims 16, 35, and 47. In particular, the Examiner has found that Falco discloses assigning page requests relating to different services to each of the page queues based on the determined service-to-queue mapping.

Amended claims 16, 35, and 47 now include the limitation that the step of assigning each of the dequeued pages to one of the paging channels, occurs after the pages are dequeued.

Falco does not disclose a method or apparatus in which dequeued pages are assigned to one of the paging channels after the pages are dequeued. The disclosure in Falco is restricted to a method for prioritizing messages within a control channel where such messages have already been accepted for transmission on the control channel. That is, the messages are assigned to the control channel and, more particularly, the time slot within the control channel corresponding to the mobile station to which the message is directed, prior to the steps of queuing and dequeuing (see column 4, lines 62-65).

The Applicant submits that in view of the amendments arguments presented herein, claims 16, 35 and 47 are not anticipated by Falco and are therefore allowable.


7. Claims 18, 37, and 49

Claims 18, 37, and 49 depend directly or indirectly on claims 16, 35 and 47. For at least the reasons expressed in section 6, above, the Applicant submits that claims 16, 35 and 47 are not anticipated by Falco, and claims 18, 37, and 49 are therefore also allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in allowable form and early allowance is respectfully awaited. However, in the event that there may be some outstanding matters which require resolution, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone at 613-232-2486, ext. 378.

Respectfully submitted,
JAGDISH SONTI ET AL

By


James McGraw
Registration No. 28,168

Dated: April 6, 2004
CBI/JMc/wfs